



Chief Judge Lisa Taylor Munyon, Chair
Florida Courts Technology Commission
c/o Office of the State Courts Administrator
500 S. Duval Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1900

April 1, 2022

The Honorable Charles T. Canady
Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Florida
500 South Duval Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1900

RE: Florida Courts Technology Commission Yearly Report

Dear Chief Justice Canady:

Under the direction of the Supreme Court, the Florida Courts Technology Commission (hereinafter “FCTC” or “Commission”) oversees, manages, and directs the development and use of technology within the judicial branch. In carrying out that purpose, the Commission performs its rule-based responsibilities consistent with the [2022-2027 Long-Range Strategic plan for the Florida Judicial Branch](#). The primary responsibilities of the Commission are developing a compatible technology infrastructure that provides timely, consistent, and useful information by enhancing technology solutions, improving case management, and supporting efficiencies that meet the needs of Florida’s State Courts System; improving data exchanges and integration processes with the clerks, the courts, and other justice system partners; and safeguard the security, integrity, and confidentiality of court data and technology systems.

As Chair of the Commission, I respectfully submit this report on the Commission’s work from April 2021 through March 2022. As you will find documented in this report, the Commission and its subcommittees continue to enhance the broad range of court services and technology solutions designed to meet the needs of court users by improving transparency, interconnectivity, innovation, and accessibility to all continuing through the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Commission is not making any recommendations to the Court at this time. It has been an honor and a privilege to contribute to these advancements and collaborative accomplishments for the state courts and judicial branch as a whole.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Lisa T. Munyon'.

Lisa T. Munyon
Circuit Chief Judge

Enclosure

Florida Courts Technology
Commission 2022 Yearly Report

April 1, 2022

Introduction

On July 1, 2010, the Florida Courts Technology Commission (“Commission”) was formed under rule 2.236, Florida Rules of Judicial Administration. The Commission was established to advise the Chief Justice and Supreme Court on matters relating to the use of technology in the judicial branch. The Commission is responsible for ensuring that trial technology initiatives are aligned with the [2022-2027 Long-Range Strategic Plan for Florida’s Judicial Branch](#) while complying with technology policies established by the Supreme Court.

Although the rise of COVID-19 cases was constant in 2021-2022, the courts continued to hold virtual meetings to conduct business and kept the courts fully operating, consistent with public safety. Whereas the courts are required to uphold the Constitution, most circuits continued holding virtual hearings while others begin in-person jury trials again as the number of coronavirus cases declined.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, progress on initiatives was delayed, however, the Commission continued to make advancements with current innovations, including eFiling, data collection, data management, and case management systems, technology solutions designed to expand access to court records, automation of court-related processes, and cybersecurity services. The Commission maintains collaboration with the Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers (“FCCC”) to establish statewide uniformity on electronic court processes and filing court records through a single statewide point of access via the Florida Courts eFiling Portal (“Portal”). Additionally, the Commission collaborated with the Florida Department of Corrections and the FCCC to automate a process for delivering electronic orders of supervision through the Portal, eFiling violation reports, affidavits, and pre-sentence investigations through the Portal, along with transforming the process for delivery of prison commitment packets from paper to electronic via the Portal.

In October 2021, the Chief Justice tasked the FCTC with surveying the circuit chief judges to determine current court cybersecurity processes, priorities,

resource needs of each circuit, and evaluate the survey responses to develop a report and recommendations by May 31, 2022. This task was ultimately referred to the Cybersecurity Subcommittee and is discussed further in the subcommittee section of this report.

In December 2021, the Chief Justice tasked the FCTC with six recommendations to incorporate into its existing subcommittees in supporting the civil case management requirements for Florida's courts. In fulfilling this request, the FCTC separated the six recommendations into three workgroups and will begin their research in the second quarter of 2022. A Standardization Workgroup will explore adopting a list of standard case types, docket codes, and document descriptions for mandatory use statewide. The Document Identification Workgroup will explore adopting standards that implement a document identification number ("DIN") process that assigns a DIN to each document filed to a case, ideally as early as the filing of the document with the Portal as well as adopt Court Automated Processing Systems ("CAPS") and Case Maintenance Systems ("CMS") standards that require functionality to associate and link documents using DINs and docket codes/descriptions. The Data Elements Workgroup will explore the adoption of a CMS standard that requires the CMS to provide the data elements necessary to the CAPS case management reporting needs along with a standard that requires CMS systems to be capable of capturing different data elements that assist in the accurate classification of a case.

Seven subcommittees and ten workgroups are working under the auspices of the Commission to focus on different areas of technology in the courts. Through its subcommittees and workgroups, the Commission has taken on several projects. The Commission's work, related to tasks assigned to each group, is described in the following Subcommittee and Workgroup Activities section.

Subcommittee and Workgroup Activities

A. Appellate Courts Technology Committee

The Appellate Courts Technology Committee (“ACTC”) is a standing committee that reports its technology-based activities to the Commission. Its purpose is to provide technical guidance and consultation to the Commission and the Office of the State Courts Administrator (“OSCA”) regarding information systems development and operational policies and procedures related to automation in Florida’s District Courts of Appeal. In addition, the ACTC is responsible for ensuring that appellate court technology initiatives are aligned with the Judicial Branch’s Long-Range Strategic Plan and comply with standards developed by the Commission.

The *Long-Range Strategic Plan* identified five issues of critical importance to the judiciary. One such issue is “[m]odernize the administration of justice and operation of court facilities,” which includes, in part, the goals of compatible technology infrastructure to improve case management, improved data exchange and integration processes with justice system partners, modernization of court processes, and innovation to meet current needs and future challenges.

To meet the case management modernization goal, the ACTC worked closely with the OSCA and the Appellate Case Management Solutions Change Advisory Board to acquire a long-term, sustainable, commercial-off-the-shelf (“COTS”) appellate case management system. The product selected is Thompson Reuter’s C-Track, the leader among COTS appellate CMSs. It provides the functionality and cloud-based architecture necessary to modernize the case management functions and meet the growing needs of the Florida Supreme Court, the five (5) District Courts of Appeal, court users, attorneys, parties on a case, and the public-at-large. The objectives include enhanced security, support for a mobile and remote workforce, workflow automation through configurable business rules, Application Programmable Interfaces (“APIs”), and other functionality missing from the current case management system. In addition, C-Track’s unified architecture combined with configurable business rules encourages

consistent practices and procedures across all appellate courts in alignment with the *Long-Range Strategic Plan*, goal 1.5. The new case management system project is fully underway; the Supreme Court and First District Court of Appeal are the first to go live and are scheduled for the first fiscal quarter of 2023.

B. Portal Subcommittee

The year 2021 marked the tenth anniversary of the Florida Courts eFiling Portal. Since its first filing in January 2011, the Portal has changed the landscape of how courts operate in Florida, serving as a gateway for filers to efile and access official court documents. Over the past ten years, usage of the Portal has grown tremendously to over 380,000 users and 27 million documents filed annually. Today, the Portal connects more than 262,000 self-represented litigants, 84,000 attorneys, 1,400 judges, and other local groups to Florida's court system.

One of the subcommittee's objectives this year was the concern with maintaining correct and current email addresses in the Portal to ascertain where to serve attorneys and lessen the strain on case management systems in keeping email addresses separate. A workgroup was formed to explore possible solutions for maintaining email addresses for electronic service where the rule allows for the designation of up to three email addresses *per* case. The workgroup discussed options associated with limiting the number of email addresses for service and sought comments from practicing attorneys. One of the alternative considerations was having the Portal mirror the data on the Florida Bar's website for the official service email address to have a single place to change email addresses. The workgroup concluded that an attorney should be permitted to designate up to three email addresses for service in court proceedings, which will apply to all court proceedings for that attorney, without variation from proceeding to proceeding.

Another objective of the subcommittee was a uniform electronic process for search and arrest warrants through the Portal. A workgroup was formed to evaluate and gather current electronic warrant processes utilized around the state. The survey responses determined there was disparity statewide that

resulted in three evenly distributed categories, with circuits not having an electronic warrant process, using the eWarrant solution developed in Twelfth Judicial Circuit, and a mix utilizing an internal email system or local law enforcement system. The workgroup evaluated the Twelfth Circuit's eWarrant system for utility. The key feature is providing the electronic highway between the law enforcement agencies and the judges with minimal costs. The workgroup divided the processes into two parts- customer portal and system integration. The customer portal includes law enforcement's submission of an application to the court, and then the court returning the approved warrant to law enforcement. The system integration includes law enforcement agencies communicating with the clerk of courts to file an electronic warrant return of executed warrants. The customer portal process was referred to the Certification subcommittee to evaluate the possibility of interfacing the eWarrant systems with the CAPS, for a direct pathway for law enforcement officers to file the electronic warrants to the courts for uniformity. The workgroup is continuing to focus on the system integration process to formalize a way for law enforcement to send the electronic warrant returns through the Portal to deliver to the clerk.

In August 2021, the Portal's maintenance release, included functionality to evaluate whether documents submitted to the Portal were Portable Document Format for Archiving ("PDF/A") compliant. Although PDF/A is the preferred format for documents filed through the Portal, 55% of documents currently being submitted are scanned as opposed to digitally created. Concerns about scanned documents being submitted and the difficulty to convert to a properly formatted PDF/A led to the formation of a workgroup to evaluate. The objective of the workgroup is to increase the number of court documents created digitally from the start to allow proper conversion so they can be filed, sent, and stored in the clerk's case maintenance systems. Until all clerks can implement storage of documents in the PDF/A format, the workgroup's initial focus will be on educating filers.

Additionally, the subcommittee continues to assist the FCCC's Standardization

Committee towards standardizing docket descriptions in the Portal. The goal is to standardize the Portal's view for filers statewide. The committee identified all the subcase types necessary for the various reporting and developed a matrix of uniform docket descriptions that will be offered in an attempt to be more unified. The next phase is to look at the different document types that are driven from the Portal down to the clerks to ensure uniformity.

Further, the subcommittee, in conjunction with the FCCC, continues to review and endorse Portal enhancement requests by users, and continues working with criminal justice stakeholders to explore additional Portal innovations in the ongoing transition towards a statewide electronic court system.

C. Cybersecurity Subcommittee

The cybersecurity subcommittee was established to recommend minimum security standards and educational training protocols for the judicial branch to safeguard court data. The subcommittee formed two workgroups to accomplish this: the Cyber Review Workgroup, to establish initial minimum-security measures; and the Cyber Education Workgroup, to provide recommendations on education and training protocols for court users and information technology ("IT") professionals.

Moreover, with the ongoing level of cybersecurity incidents around the globe, it is imperative to have cybersecurity education for court system end users along with the tools, knowledge, and certifications for IT staff to support the courts' infrastructure. The cyber education workgroup is in the preliminary phase of identifying existing training resources to leverage statewide training for all judicial branch employees. The workgroup will coordinate with the respective training certification entities for judges and attorneys to include cyber training in their annual continuing judicial education and continuing legal education credits.

Additionally, the education workgroup coordinated two demonstration offerings of Microsoft's educational portal as a no-cost training resource to state

government employees. The invitation for the demonstrations included all trial court technology officers and expanded to include their IT staff. The demonstrations provided IT staff an opportunity to learn about an educational resource that circuits can utilize to provide the required technical support for the courts.

In November 2021, the cyber review workgroup reviewed OSCA's Office of Inspector General IT Controls Questionnaire, which is applied when performing audits. Security audits provide a way to identify areas of concern, and incorporating these areas into the model policies will assist in providing improved compliance with future audits. Although the questionnaire included areas that were already encompassed in the initial set of model policies, the workgroup identified two additional areas: governance and physical security. These two model policies were developed and ultimately approved by the FCTC at its February 11, 2022 meeting which completes the initial set of ten model policies.

The cyber review workgroup developed an Information Security Charter ("Charter") that outlines the responsibilities of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee and defines the purpose, scope, and objectives. As referenced in the charter, the cybersecurity framework will establish a standard approach to securing court information for stakeholders within the judicial branch by developing model security policies for circuits to modify and adopt. These model policies will assist the courts in executing cybersecurity responsibilities and safeguarding the security, integrity, and confidentiality of court data and technology systems.

In October 2021, the Chief Justice tasked the FCTC to identify areas of process improvements by surveying the chief judges on current cybersecurity processes, priorities, and resource needs for each county within the circuits and prepare a report with its findings and recommendations by May 31, 2022. This task was ultimately referred to the FCTC's Cybersecurity Subcommittee. The subcommittee established a workgroup that consists of a Circuit Court Judge and five Trial Court Technology Officers.

The Cybersecurity Workgroup developed survey questions and submitted the survey to the chief judges in November 2021. The survey responses were grouped into three categories – staffing needs, policies and guidance, and response to past incidents. Upon careful examination of the circuit responses, the workgroup developed percentages for each of the questions to provide a more in-depth analysis. The workgroup is continuing to analyze the survey responses and develop recommendations to include in the report.

The cybersecurity subcommittee continues to evaluate and share information about cyber breaches throughout the state and nationally.

D. Joint Florida Courts Technology Commission/Florida Department of Corrections Workgroup

The Joint Florida Courts Technology Commission and Florida Department of Corrections (“Department”) Workgroup continue to explore the extent to which the Department can utilize the Portal for efilings documents between the Department and the courts. The Department finalized a process for delivering electronic orders of supervision through the Portal. The electronic process includes the use of tablets in the courtroom to generate the orders and electronically submit them to the court for approval in lieu of paper. Additionally, the Department worked with circuit administrators and the FCCC Portal team to provide guidance on efilings violation reports, affidavits, and pre-sentence investigations through the Portal. Currently, two circuits are complete and working with other circuits to implement the efilings efficiencies to improve electronic interactions between the Department and the courts.

Based on an initiative that began within the workgroup, the Department has had success in transforming the process for delivery of prison commitment packets to the North Florida and Central Florida Reception Centers from paper to electronic via the Portal. The process is being expanded to the South Florida Reception Center (“SFRC”). With 17 counties delivering inmates to the SFRC, the Department anticipates all three major reception centers will soon be processing commitment packets electronically.

While the COVID-19 pandemic has presented challenges, the crisis has brought about an expansion of the use of teleconferencing platforms to conduct legal proceedings. The Courts' establishment of this technology infrastructure has created an opportunity to provide inmates in state correctional facilities with remote video access to certain court proceedings. On November 8, 2021, the Department's bureau chiefs, representatives from the courts, the Florida Sheriff's Association, and the Public Defender Association met to explore the possibilities. Although challenged by security, funding, and staffing shortages, the Department has agreed to work with the courts and other stakeholders to explore establishing a process to allow inmate remote video appearances.

E. Joint Florida Courts Technology Commission/Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration Committee Workgroup

The Joint FCTC/RGPJAC Workgroup is being reconstituted to work on a number of items: 1) standardized fonts for trial courts that would facilitate the conversion of the filings to the PDF/A format and help with ADA compliance, 2) limiting the number of email accounts that a filer may register and use for filing/serving documents through the Portal, and 3) sworn verifications versus notarizations for electronically filed documents.

The Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration Committee submitted a package of proposed and amended rules addressing electronic filing, service, and documents to the Supreme Court that affects technology in the courts, (*In re: Amendments to the Florida Rules of Judicial Administration and Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.030 - Electronic Filing and Service, SC19-2163*). The rule amendments were rejected by the Court on March 5, 2021. The RGPJAC is working with all interested persons on revising the proposed rules to address the concerns that were raised in the case. The RGPJAC is also addressing electronic signatures and the extent of certifications by attorneys when signing documents. These efforts may result in further referrals to the Joint FCTC/RPGJAC Workgroup.

F. Civil Case Management Workgroup

Chief Justice Canady issued *In re: Comprehensive COVID-19 Emergency Measures For Florida Trial Courts*, Fla. Admin. Order No. AOSC20-23, Amendment 12 (April 13, 2021) announcing requirements for the trial courts to actively manage civil court cases for the purpose of maximizing the timely resolution of cases. Three categories of cases were identified: 1) complex, 2) streamlined, and 3) general. AOSC20-23 classifies non-complex cases as either streamlined or general. The trial court case management obligations are driven by whether a case is complex, streamlined, or general. Case management orders have to be issued in each streamlined and general case that establishes deadlines for reaching various milestones during the pendency of the case, with the ultimate objective being the establishment of a firm trial date.

The chief justice requested the Commission to: 1) evaluate the case management requirements contained in AOSC20-23, in comparison with the currently available case management solutions, to determine whether the current solutions are capable, with modification, of facilitating the functionality needed to comply with the case management requirements of AOSC20-23, 2) review the capabilities of the compliant Court Application Processing Systems (“CAPS”) and recommend any standards that may need to be adopted to support automation of the case management tasks required by AOSC20-23; and 3) collaborate with the clerks of court to review the current capabilities of clerk case maintenance systems (“CMS”), as well as the Portal, and recommend any enhancements that may be needed to capture and provide the information needed for case management to the CAPS systems.

As a result of the request, the Civil Case Management Workgroup was established to evaluate the request and formulate a response. The workgroup was comprised of judges and clerks of court on the Commission. The workgroup focused on 1) identifying the currently available functionality within the CAPS and CMS systems with regard to automation of case management, and 2) making recommendations for modifications to the Functional Requirements for Court

Application Processing System and the Consolidated Case Maintenance System Standards that would result in maximized automation of case management tasks.

The workgroup submitted the *Technology Solutions to Support the Civil Case Management Requirements for Florida Courts* report (“Technology Solutions Report”) to the Supreme Court. The report included the following recommendations for modifications to the CAPS and CMS systems to maximize automation of the case management requirements announced within AOSC20-23: 1) adopt a list of standard case types, docket codes, and document descriptions, as well as a party/participant naming convention, for mandatory use statewide, including docket codes for identifying civil cases as general, streamlined, or complex, 2) adopt standards that implement a document identification number (“DIN”) process that assigns to each document filed to a case, a case-specific DIN, ideally as early as the filing of the document with the portal, 3) adopt CAPS and CMS standards that require functionality within these systems to effectively associate and link documents using DINs and docket codes/descriptions, as well as by party name, 4) adopt a CAPS standard that requires each CAPS compliant system to provide a “report builder” component within the application, 5) adopt a CMS standard that requires the CMS system to provide the data elements necessary to the CAPS system’s case management reporting needs as prescribed in AOSC20-23, and 6) adopt CMS standards that require CMS systems to be capable of capturing different data elements that assist in the accurate classification of a case as general, streamlined, or complex.

In December 2021, Chief Justice Canady sent a letter referring the workgroup’s recommendations to the Commission to implement concomitantly.

G. Certification Subcommittee

The Certification Subcommittee was established to certify Court Application Processing System solutions in compliance with the Functional Requirements for Court Application Processing System (“functional requirements”). Mentis Technology Solutions, Pioneer Technology Group, OSCA’s Cross-Jurisdictional

Support Unit, the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit, the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit, and the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit e CAPS were certified on the latest 5.0 version during the reporting period.

The purposes of the CAPS are to 1) provide judges with rapid and reliable access to case information, 2) provide access and use electronic case files and other data sources from the clerks of court CMS to manage cases more effectively and efficiently; 3) schedule and conduct hearings, 4) adjudicate disputed issues, 5) record and report judicial activity, and 6) allow judges to prepare or accept, review, modify, electronically sign, file, and serve orders.

The subcommittee is updating the Functional Requirements for CAPS to include several FCTC recommendations approved by the Court. One recommendation is to display case status information through the CAPS. The Supreme Court recognizes six status classifications to display in CAPS. The subcommittee drafted a case status standard requiring all CAPS to display the current case status using terms approved by the Supreme Court. The case status will be displayed when viewing the case number and when the user “hovers” the cursor over the status, a pop-up containing the definition of the Supreme Court approved case status will be displayed to the user. Additionally, all case statuses in the clerk’s CMS must map to/conform with *In re: Trial Court Case-Event Definitional Framework*, Fla. Admin. Order No. AOSC14-20 (March 26, 2014). The subcommittee will work with the CMS Standards Subcommittee to ensure the data is displayed accurately.

The subcommittee is tasked with several recommendations from the Technology Solutions Report discussed in detail in the [Civil Case Management Standards Workgroup](#) section. A further recommendation is to capture all costs and fines assessed by the judge as discrete data elements and display those data elements in a cost matrix for each case, cross-referenced to the statutory tables; auto populated with the mandatory fines, fees, and cost assessments and referenced to discretionary assessments. This feature would better prepare the court to assess the appropriate costs consistently.

These recommendations will be included in Version 6.0 of the *Functional*

Requirements for Court Application Processing Systems.

Lastly, for the judicial branch to continue to enhance the utilization of technology in a uniform manner that increases the effectiveness, efficiency, and accessibility of the state courts to move towards full automation, the Supreme Court issued *In re: Judicial E-Filing*, Fla. Admin. Order No. AOSC19-74 (Nov. 1, 2019). To date, a total of 19 counties have implemented judicial e-filing.

H. CMS Standards Subcommittee

The CMS Standards Subcommittee was established to develop standards for clerks' case maintenance systems to assure that such systems meet the needs of the judiciary for the clerks' court-related functions, as well as the needs of The Florida Bar and other partners.

The subcommittee will update the *Consolidated Case Maintenance System Standards* to include several recommendations from the Technology Solutions Report discussed in detail in the [Civil Case Management Standards Workgroup](#) section.

The subcommittee will work with the Certification Subcommittee to ensure that correct data elements are captured and accurately displays court-specific case status classifications in the CAPS.

The subcommittee discussed a report from the Judicial Management Council's Workgroup on the Improved Resolution of Civil Cases. This report includes recommendations for numerous comprehensive changes to a wide variety of current case management practices and details potential rule changes. Once the Workgroup recommendations are considered by the Court, the subcommittee will review the changes that will impact the case management systems.

Additionally, the subcommittee will continue to review data quality issues and work on a standard to implement the Trial Court Performance and Accountability's Data Quality Workgroup's recommendations regarding data quality.

Further, the subcommittee reviewed a list of instances where the term “party” was used in relation to court activity. There were over 315 case party types. Party types need to be defined and used uniformly statewide. A decision will have to be made on what party types clerks and courts will be expected to rely upon.

As stated above in the [Portal Subcommittee](#) update, the clerks are creating a matrix with a set of uniform docket descriptions that will align with specific subcase types. The matrix will provide enough specificity that the court will be able to find its documents quickly. Also, the matrix will avoid the proliferation of docket descriptions which will improve data quality and prevent misuse and miscalculation of the data.

I. Access Governance Board

Through Florida Administrative Order AOSC14-19, *In re: Standards for Access to Electronic Court Records* (amended May 23, 2014), the Supreme Court adopted the Standards and the Access Security Matrix. The Standards and Matrix are kept current through amendments promulgated by Administrative Orders of the Court. For the judicial branch to continue to ensure responsible access to electronic court records, the Access Governance Board (“Board”) periodically submits recommendations to modify the Standards and the Matrix to the Court for approval.

During this reporting period, the Board recommended adding the Office of Statewide Prosecution to User Role 2, Florida State Attorney’s Offices in the Standards and Matrix. The Board also recommended several administrative and structural changes to the Standards, including modifying the privacy designation of the following case types from “P” (public) to “C” (confidential) in the Matrix: Juvenile Delinquency, Juvenile Dependency, Juvenile Truancy, Domestic Relations Adoption (Final), DR Adoption (while open and pending), Termination of Parental Rights, Juvenile Miscellaneous, Tuberculosis/STD Treatment/Other Confidential.

Additionally, the Board recommended revisions to the Standards to match the Matrix for User Roles 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 14 to read:

All records except those that are expunged or sealed, or unless Level “B” access is assigned to this role in the Access Security Matrix, those records are automatically confidential under rule 2.420(d)(1), Fla. R. Gen. Prac. & Jud. Admin., or made confidential by court order.

And the Board recommended revisions to the Standards to match the Matrix for User Roles 12 and 13:

All records except those that are expunged or sealed; or, unless “B” level access is assigned to this role in the Access Security Matrix, access may be denied to records or information automatically confidential under rule 2.420(d)(1), Fla. R. Gen. Prac. & Jud. Admin., or made confidential by court order, depending upon the type of case and the language of the court order.

Also, the Board recommended revisions to the descriptive language for Level B and Level C Access in the Matrix as follows:

B. All but expunged, or sealed under Ch. 943, F.S., or sealed by court order; and

C. All but expunged, or sealed under Ch. 943, F.S. or sealed by court order or confidential under Fla. R. Gen. Prac. & Jud. Admin. 2.420.

The Court adopted the abovementioned recommendations through Fla. Admin. Order No. AOSC21-45, *In re: Access to Electronic Court Records* (September 3, 2021).

The Commission submitted recommendations to the Court in January 2022. After an initial review of the requests, the Court requested that each agency or entity seeking to modify the Matrix provide the statutory basis for their specific request for expanded access. To ensure the Court had sufficient information to determine if the request was supported by the appropriate legal authority, OSCA staff

reached out to agencies and requested they complete a *Supplemental Request Form to Amend the Standards for Access to Electronic Court Records or the Access Security Matrix* and provide the specific rule or statutory citation which supports their request for expanded access to electronic court records on the Matrix. After receiving the supplemental information, the Commission modified its recommendation to recommend the Court approve the Commission's recommendations allowing the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the Justice Administrative Commission, the Office of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel, and The Florida Bar the access they requested. These recommendations were submitted to the Court. The Court approved the Commission's recommendations on March 24, 2022.

Lastly, the Board modified the *Agency Registration Agreement to View Records Online* and the *Request Form to Amend the Standards and Matrix*.

The Year Ahead

In the coming year, the Commission will continue to focus on various technology initiatives affecting the judicial branch, including 1) enhancing civil case management functionality in the judicial branch by incorporating the recommendations from the *Technology Solutions Report*, 2) propagating court policies and procedures to assist with the framework for a fully automated trial court case management system, 3) developing standards for the court-related functions of the clerks' case maintenance systems, 4) working with The Florida Bar Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration Committee to reconcile inconsistencies and modernize the rules in a manner that recognizes the use of technology to conduct court business, 5) analyzing the cybersecurity posture in Florida and developing a plan to implement model security policies statewide, 6) working with the FCCC on standardizing docket descriptions, and 7) updating the Court Technology Strategic Plan. Through the collaboration and hard work of the diverse members of the Commission and its many justice partners, the Commission is honored to have the opportunity to build upon its tradition of successful leadership and contributions to the judicial branch's

The Honorable Charles T. Canady

April 1, 2022

P a g e | 19

evolution to a fully functioning electronic court.